

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough examination of the present application. The Office Action, however, continued to reject all examined claims 1-4 and 6-32. In response, Applicant submits the foregoing amendments and the following remarks. Specifically, claims 6, 7, 21, and 22 are cancelled, thereby rendering the rejections of those claims moot. Claims 1, 17, 14 and 30 are amended based on the embodiment of Fig. 4b. Accordingly, no new matter is added to the application by these amendments. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections for at least the following reasons.

Discussion of Rejections Under 35 USC 112

The Office Action rejected all claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Claims 1 and 17 previously recited: “response code greater than 199.” The Office Action states that this language was not supported in the original specification. Accordingly, claims 1 and 17 are amended to overcome the rejection. The embodiment of Fig. 4b in page 8 lines 18-30 is incorporated into the claims, which now state: “the SIP response message is a final response initialized by the second UE.”

In the amendment, the SIP response message is a final response. The “486 busy here” in the embodiment of Fig. 4b is a kind of final response message defined in IETF RFC 3261 Sect. 21 (pp. 182-193), which can be accessed by Google.

The rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs should be withdrawn.

Discussion of Rejections Under 35 USC 103

The Office Action rejected independent claims 1 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over the Bell Labs Technical Journal article in view of Mayer (US 2005/0015499). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

The Office Action alleged that there is no difference between a “SIP request message” and a “SIP response message” because the Application server may modify the request and send it back to the S-CSCF as a response (citing pages 32-33, col. 2 and 1, lines 5-15 and 1-5, respectively).

To more clearly distinguish the difference between the SIP request message and the SIP response message, independent claims 1 and 17 are amended based on the embodiment of Fig. 4b. In the amendment, the SIP request message is initialized from a first UE (UE1), and the SIP response message is the “486 busy” message generated by the second UE (UE2). As known, the “486 busy” message is a kind of final response. Since the difference between “SIP request message” and the “SIP response message” are clear, the comparison with the Bell Labs Technical Journal (pages 32 and 33) is no longer applicable. For at least this reason, the rejection should be withdrawn.

In addition, the operation of: “a Serving Call Session forwarding the SIP request message to a second UE without going through an application server” is not taught in the Bell Labs Technical Journal article. Support can be found in the embodiment in Fig.

4b, page 8 lines 21-23, which stated: “The S-CSCF 423 forwards the SIP invite message to UE2 435 via the P-CSCF 431 without going through the AS 424a.”

Thus, claim 1 defines a method to trigger the application server based on a SIP response message sent from the second UE, instead of a SIP request message sent from a first UE. The SIP response message is a final response, specifically, “486 busy here.” Claim 14 is amended to recite this limitation. Claims 15-16 specify further alternatives that a SIP response message may represent.

Turning to the specific language of claim 1, claim 1 recites:

1. A triggering method for IP multimedia service control, comprising the steps of:
a first User Equipment (UE) initializing a Session Initial Protocol (SIP) request message;
a Serving Call Session Control Function (S-CSCF) recording the SIP request message and forwarding the SIP request message to a second UE without going through an application server;
the S-CSCF receiving a SIP response message initialized by the second UE associated to the SIP request message;
the S-CSCF examining the SIP response message according to a set of response Filter Criteria (rFC), comprising specific responses triggering individual application services available from a service provider; and
re-issuing the SIP request message to the application server designated by the rFC if the SIP response message matches Service Point Triggers (SPTs) of one of the rFC; wherein the SIP response message is a final response initialized by the second UE.

(Emphasis added). Claim 1 patently defines over the cited art for at least the reasons that the cited art fails to disclose the features emphasized above.

Claims 17 and 30 are amended respectively. As amended, claim 17 recites:

17. An Internet Protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem, comprising:
one or more application servers each designated by a response Filter Criteria (rFC) to provide a service; and

a Serving Call Session Control Function (S-CSCF), **forwarding a Session Initial Protocol (SIP) request message initialized by a first User Equipment (UE) to a second UE without going through an application server, receiving a Session Initial Protocol (SIP) response message initialized by the second UE associated to a the SIP request message**, examining the SIP response message by a set of response Filter Criteria (rFC), and **re-issuing the SIP request message to the application server when a Service Point Trigger (SPT) in a rFC that designates to the application server is matched by the SIP response message**; wherein the SIP response message is a final response initialized by the second UE.

(Emphasis added). Claim 17 patently defines over the cited art for at least the reasons that the cited art fails to disclose the features emphasized above.

Specifically, the Office Action states: “Mayer discloses examining a corresponding SIP response message received by the S-CSCF according to a set of response Filter Criteria (rFC) (SIP request received is forwarded to S-CSCF (Fig. 2, 21, 22, paragraph [0025], page 3, lines 10-15) and S-CSCF responds to SIP request per the event filter, Fig. 2, 23, paragraph [0025], lines 15-17)”. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In this regard, it appears that the Office Action has interpreted the “SIP SUBSCRIBE request” of Mayer as being the SIP request message, and has interpreted step 23 of Fig. 2 as being the SIP response message. However, with this interpretation, the fundamental operation of Mayer would be different than that defined in claim 1. In Claim 1, the S-CSCF receives an SIP response message associated with the SIP request message, and re-issues an SIP request message to somewhere according to something matched by the SIP response message. In Mayer’s Fig. 2 step 23, the S-CSCF responds to the SIP request per the event filter by sending an SIP

request to somewhere else (local service configuration server 17). Mayer never discusses or suggests an operation dependent on an SIP response message. For at least this additional reason, the rejection of claim 17 should be withdrawn.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1 and 17. Moreover, Applicant submits that the dependent claims not specifically addressed herein are allowable for the reasons discussed in pertinent portions associated with their independent claims 1 and 17, as well as for their own additional features. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections. Reconsideration of all claims is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that a teleconference would be helpful to expedite the examination of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

No additional fee is believed to be due in connection with this amendment and response. If, however, any additional fee is deemed to be payable, you are hereby authorized to charge any such fee to Deposit Account No. 20-0778.

Respectfully submitted,

/Daniel R. McClure/

By:

Daniel R. McClure, Reg. No. 38,962

Thomas, Kayden, Horstemeyer & Risley, LLP
600 Galleria Pkwy, SE
Suite 1500
Atlanta, GA 30339
770-933-9500